arXiv:0809.4627v1 [stat.CO] 26 Sep 2008

SOLVING THE 100 SWISS FRANCS PROBLEM

SHUHONG GAO, GUANGRAN JIANG, AND MINGFU ZHU

Abstract. Sturmfels offered 100 Swiss Francs in 2005 to a conjecture, which deals with a special case of the maximum likelihood estimation for a latent class model. A positive solution for this conjecture is presented in this paper.

1. The conjecture and its statistics background

Sturmfels [7] proposed the following problem: Maximize the likelihood function

$$L(P) = \prod_{i=1}^{4} p_{ii}^4 \times \prod_{i\neq j} p_{ij}^2 \tag{1}$$

over the set of all 4×4-matrices $P = (p_{ij})$ whose entries are nonnegative and sum to 1 and whose rank is at most two. Based on numerical experiments by employing an EM algorithm, Sturmfels [5,7] conjectured that the matrix

$$P = \frac{1}{40}\begin{pmatrix} 3 & 3 & 2 & 2 \\ 3 & 3 & 2 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 3 & 3 \\ 2 & 2 & 3 & 3 \end{pmatrix}$$

is a global maximum of $L(P)$. He offered 100 Swiss francs for a rigorous proof in a postgraduate course held at ETH Zürich in 2005.

Partial results were given in the paper [2], where the general statistical background for this problem is also presented. This problem is a special case of the maximum likelihood estimation for a latent class model. More precisely, by following [2], let $(X_1, \ldots, X_d)$ be a discrete multivariate random vector where each X_j takes value from a finite state set $S_j = \{1, \ldots, s_j\}$. Let $\Omega = \otimes_{j=1}^{d} S_j$ be the sample space. For each $(x_1, \ldots, x_d) \in \Omega$, the joint probability mass function

---

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 65H10; Secondary 62P10, 62F30.

Key words and phrases. Maximum likelihood estimation, latent class model, solving polynomial equations, algebraic statistics.

of $(X_1, \ldots, X_d)$ is denoted as

$$p(x_1, \ldots, x_d) = P\{(X_1, \ldots, X_d) = (x_1, \ldots, x_d)\}.$$

The variables $X_1, \ldots, X_d$ may not be mutually independent generally. By introducing an unobservable variable H defined on the set $[r] = \{1, \ldots r\}$, $X_1, \ldots, X_d$ become mutually independent. The joint probability mass function in the newly formed model is

$$\begin{aligned} p(x_1, \ldots, x_d, h) &= P\{(X_1, \ldots, X_d, H) = (x_1, \ldots, x_d, h)\} \\ &= p(x_1|h) \cdots p(x_d|h)\lambda_h \end{aligned}$$

where λ_h is the marginal probability of $P\{H = h\}$ and $p(x_j|h)$ is the conditional probability $P\{X_j = x_j|H = h\}$. We denote this new r-class mixture model by $\mathcal{H}$. The marginal distribution of $(X_1, \ldots, X_d)$ in $\mathcal{H}$ is given by the probability mass function (which is also called *accounting equations* [3])

$$p(x_1, \ldots, x_d) = \sum_{h \in [r]} p(x_1, \ldots, x_d, h) = \sum_{h \in [r]} p(x_1|h) \cdots p(x_d|h)\lambda_h.$$

In practice, a collection of samples from Ω are observed. For each $(x_1, \ldots, x_d)$, let $n(x_1, \ldots, x_d) \in \mathbb{N}$ be the number of observed occurrences of $(x_1, \ldots, x_d)$ in the samples. While the parameters $p(x_1|h), \cdots$, $p(x_d|h)$, $\lambda_h, p(x_1, \ldots, x_d)$ are unknown. The maximum likelihood estimation problem is to find the model parameters that can best explain the observed data, that is, to determine the global maxima of the likelihood function

$$L(\mathcal{H}) = \prod_{(x_1, \ldots, x_d) \in \Omega} p(x_1, \ldots, x_d)^{n(x_1, \ldots, x_d)}.$$

Since each $p(x_1, \ldots, x_d)$ is nonnegative, it is equivalent but more convenient to use the log-likelihood function

$$l(\mathcal{H}) = \sum_{(x_1, \ldots, x_d) \in \Omega} n(x_1, \ldots, x_d) \ln p(x_1, \ldots, x_d), \tag{2}$$

where we define $\ln(0) = -\infty$. Finding the maxima of (2) is difficult and remains infeasible by current symbolic software [1,4]. We can only handle some special cases: small models or highly symmetric table. The 100 Swiss francs problem is the special case of $\mathcal{H}$ when $d = 2$, $S_1 = S_2 = \{$A,C,G,T$\}$, $s_1 = s_2 = 4$ and $r = 2$. It is related to a DNA sequence alignment problem as described in [5]. In that example, the contingency table for the observed counts of ordered pairs of nucleotides (i.e. AA, AC, AG, AT, CA, CC, $\cdots$) is

$$\begin{array}{c} \\ \text{A} \\ \text{C} \\ \text{G} \\ \text{T} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{cccc} \text{A} & \text{C} & \text{G} & \text{T} \end{array} \\ \begin{pmatrix} 4 & 2 & 2 & 2 \\ 2 & 4 & 2 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 4 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 2 & 4 \end{pmatrix} \end{array}.$$

So the likelihood function (2) in this example is exactly (1).

Even for this simple case, the problem is highly non-trivial and remains surprisingly difficult. We know that the global maxima must exist, as the region of the parameters is closed. By using EM algorithm or Newton-Raphson method and starting from suitable points, one can find some local maxima of the likelihood function. However, the global maximum property is not guaranteed.

Our paper is organized as follows. We first derive some general properties for optimal solutions in Section 2, then we prove the conjecture in Section3. In Section 4, we make some comments on why Gröbner basis technique does not work efficiently, and suggest several new conjectures in more general cases.

2. General Properties

We focus on general $n \times n$ matrices $P = (p_{ij})$ in this section. For convenience we scale each entry of P by n^2 so the entries sum to n^2, and take square root of the original likelihood function. So we may assume that

$$L(P) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} p_{ii}^2 \times \prod_{i \neq j} p_{ij}. \tag{3}$$

The problem is

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{Maximize:} & \text{L(P)} \\ \text{Subject to:} & \sum\limits_{1 \leq i,j \leq n} p_{ij} = n^2, \text{ and} \\ & p_{ij} \geq 0,\ 1 \leq i, j \leq n. \end{array}$$

Suppose $P = (p_{ij})_{n \times n}$ is a global maximum of $L(P)$. Apparently P cannot be the following $n \times n$ matrix

$$J = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \dots & 1 \\ \vdots & & \vdots \\ 1 & \dots & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

as we have many other matrices (for instance, the resulting matrix by setting $s = 2, t = 1$ for the matrix in Conjecture 12 and then scaling by n^2) with larger likelihood value.

Since the function (3) is a continuous function in p_{ij}'s, if one of the entries of P approaches 0, the product has to approach 0 too, as the other entries are bounded by n^2. Hence the optimal solutions must occur in interior points and we don't need to worry about the boundary where some $p_{ij} = 0$.

In the following discussion, we assume that $P \neq J$ and all its entries are positive. We show that P must have certain symmetry properties.

Lemma 1. *For an optimal solution P, its row sums and column sums must all equal n.*

Proof. Let $\sum\limits_{j=1}^{n} p_{ij} = s_i$. Then $\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} s_i = n^2$ and $\prod\limits_{i} s_i \leq n^n$ with equality if and only if $s_i = n$ for all i. Let $\bar{p}_{ij} = \frac{n}{s_i} p_{ij}$ and $\bar{P} = (\bar{p}_{ij})_{n \times n}$. Then $\operatorname{rank}(\bar{P}) = \operatorname{rank}(P)$ and $\sum\limits_{i,j} \bar{p}_{ij} = n^2$. However,

$$L(\bar{P}) = \left(\frac{n^n}{\prod\limits_{i} s_i} \right)^{n+1} \cdot L(P) \geq L(P)$$

with equality if and only if $s_i = n$ for all i. Since P is a global maximum, $L(\bar{P}) \leq L(P)$. Therefore each row sum equals n. Similarly, each column sum equals n as well. ☐

We shall express P in a form that involves fewer variables and has no rank constraint. Since P has rank at most two, by singular value decomposition theorem, there are column vectors u_1, u_2, v_1 and v_2 of length n such that

$$P = \sigma_1 u_1 v_1^t + \sigma_2 u_2 v_2^t$$

for some nonnegative numbers σ_1 and σ_2. By Proposition 1, P has equal row and column sums, so P has the vectors $(1, 1, \ldots, 1)$ and $(1, 1, \ldots, 1)^t$ as its left and right eigenvectors both with eigenvalue 1. Hence we may assume that $\sigma_1 = 1$ and $u_1 = v_1 = (1, 1, \ldots, 1)^t$. Let $v_2 = (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n)^t$ and $\sigma_2 u_2 = (b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_n)^t$. Then P has the form

$$P = J + \begin{pmatrix} b_1 \\ \vdots \\ b_n \end{pmatrix} (a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 + a_1 b_1 & \cdots & 1 + a_n b_1 \\ \vdots & 1 + a_i b_j & \vdots \\ 1 + a_1 b_n & \cdots & 1 + a_n b_n \end{pmatrix}.$$

In this form, P has rank at most two. Also, the condition $\sum\limits_{ij} p_{ij} = n^2$ becomes

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i = 0. \tag{4}$$

We have transformed the original problem to the following optimization problem:

$$\text{Maximize:} \quad l(P) = 2\sum_{i=1}^{n} \ln(1 + a_i b_i) + \sum_{i \neq j} \ln(1 + a_i b_j)$$

$$\text{Subject to: equation (4) and } 1 + a_i b_j > 0,\ 1 \leq i, j \leq n.$$

The Lagrangian function would be

$$\Lambda(P, \lambda) = l(P) + \lambda \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i$$

where $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. Any local extrema must satisfy

$$\frac{\partial \Lambda(P, \lambda)}{\partial a_i} = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{b_j}{1 + a_i b_j} + \frac{b_i}{1 + a_i b_i} + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^{n} b_j = 0, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n, \tag{5}$$

and

$$\frac{\partial \Lambda(P, \lambda)}{\partial b_j} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{a_i}{1 + a_i b_j} + \frac{a_j}{1 + a_j b_j} + \lambda \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i = 0, \quad 1 \leq j \leq n. \tag{6}$$

By Lemma 1, for an optimal solution P, its row sums and column sums must be all equal to n. This means that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i = 0, \tag{7}$$

and

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i = 0. \tag{8}$$

Plugging (7) and (8) into (5) and (6) respectively, we obtain the following lemma.

Lemma 2. *A global maximum P must satisfy*

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{b_j}{1 + a_i b_j} + \frac{b_i}{1 + a_i b_i} = 0, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n, \tag{9}$$

and

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{a_i}{1 + a_i b_j} + \frac{a_j}{1 + a_j b_j} = 0, \quad 1 \leq j \leq n. \tag{10}$$

Doing some simple algebra yields

Corollary 3. *An optimal solution must satisfy*

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{1}{1 + a_i b_j} + \frac{1}{1 + a_i b_i} = n + 1, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n, \tag{11}$$

and

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{1+a_i b_j} + \frac{1}{1+a_j b_j} = n+1, \quad 1 \le j \le n. \tag{12}$$

Proof. Multiply (9) by a_i and then add $\sum\limits_{j=1}^{n} \frac{1}{1+a_i b_j} + \frac{1}{1+a_i b_i}$ at both sides, we can get (11). □

The $2n$ equations derived by clearing denominators of the equations in Lemma 2 or Corollary 3 along with equations (7) and (8) form a system $\mathcal{S}$ of $2n+2$ polynomial equations with $2n$ unknowns, whose solution contains all global maxima. From computational view point we may solve $\mathcal{S}$ by brute force, like utilizing Gröbner basis method, and then compare the local extrema to achieve the global maximum. However current symbolic computation softwares like Magma, Maple, Singular and so on are still infeasible to compute a Gröbner basis for $n = 4$ by using the computers available to us.

Our strategy below is to prove that P should have high symmetry: firstly a_i's and b_i's are in the same order: if $a_i > a_j > 0$, then $b_i > b_j > 0$ correspondingly (Lemma 4 and 5). For the case $n = 4$ once we force $a_1 = b_1$ by scaling, we can eventually prove $a_i = b_i$ for all other i's (Lemma 7 and 9). With 4 a_i's remaining, we prove that the a_i's with the same signs must be identical. Finally one can solve the system by hand. Note that in [2] they derived results similar to Lemmas 4 and 5, but our approach is fairly different.

Lemma 4. *For every i,*

(1) $a_i = 0$ *if and only if* $b_i = 0$, *and*
(2) $a_i > 0$ *if and only if* $b_i > 0$.

Proof. (1) Plugging in $a_i = 0$ to the equation (9), we have $\sum\limits_{j=1}^{n} b_j + b_i = 0$, thus $b_i = 0$. Similarly, if $b_i = 0$ then $a_i = 0$.
(2) Note that $g(x) = \frac{1}{x}$ is concave up in $(0, \infty)$. By Jensen's Inequality,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{1}{n} \cdot \frac{1}{1+a_i b_j} \ge \frac{1}{\sum\limits_{j=1}^{n} \frac{1}{n}(1+a_i b_j)} = 1.$$

That is,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} \frac{1}{1+a_i b_j} \ge n.$$

Compare with equation (11), we get

$$\frac{1}{1+a_ib_i} \leq 1,$$

so $a_ib_i \geq 0$. We conclude that $a_i > 0$ if and only if $b_i > 0$. □

Lemma 5. *For i and j,*

(1) *$a_i = a_j$ if and only if $b_i = b_j$, and*
(2) *$a_i > a_j$ if and only if $b_i > b_j$.*

Proof. (1) Suppose $b_i = b_j$. Then, by (10),

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{a_k}{1+a_kb_i} + \frac{a_i}{1+a_ib_i} = 0 \text{ and } \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{a_k}{1+a_kb_j} + \frac{a_j}{1+a_jb_j} = 0.$$

Then $\frac{a_i}{1+a_ib_i} = \frac{a_j}{1+a_jb_j}$, so $a_i = a_j$. Similarly, using (9), we have that if $a_i = a_j$ then $b_i = b_j$.

(2) Switch b_i, b_j in P to form a new matrix $\bar{P}$. Then we should have $L(P) \geq L(\bar{P})$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} L(P) - L(\bar{P}) &= C_1 \cdot ((1+a_ib_i)^2(1+a_ib_j)(1+a_jb_i)(1+a_jb_j)^2 \\ &\quad -(1+a_ib_j)^2(1+a_ib_i)(1+a_jb_j)(1+a_jb_i)^2) \\ &= C_2 \cdot ((1+a_ib_i)(1+a_jb_j) - (1+a_ib_j)(1+a_jb_i)) \\ &= C_2 \cdot (a_ib_i + a_jb_j - a_ib_j - a_jb_i) \\ &= C_2 \cdot (a_i - a_j)(b_i - b_j) \end{aligned}$$

where C_1, C_2 are products of some entries of P, so C_1, C_2 are positive. Thus $(a_i - a_j)(b_i - b_j) \geq 0$. Note that $a_i = a_j$ if and only if $b_i = b_j$ by part(1), we conclude that $a_i > a_j$ if and only if $b_i > b_j$. □

3. Proof for the conjecture

We complete the proof for the conjecture in this section. From now on we focus on the case when $n = 4$. By Lemma 5, we can always assume $a_1 \geq a_2 \geq a_3 \geq a_4$ and $b_1 \geq b_2 \geq b_3 \geq b_4$. We know $a_1 \neq 0$, otherwise $P = J$. So we replace (a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4) in P by $\sqrt{\frac{a_1}{b_1}}(a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4)$ and $(b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4)^t$ by $\sqrt{\frac{b_1}{a_1}}(b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4)^t$. It turns out that $1 + \sqrt{\frac{a_1}{b_1}}a_i\sqrt{\frac{b_1}{a_1}}b_i = 1 + a_ib_j$ for any i and j, so we may always assume $a_1 = b_1$. Thus P can be expressed as the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1+a_1^2 & 1+a_2a_1 & 1+a_3a_1 & 1+a_4a_1 \\ 1+a_1b_2 & 1+a_2b_2 & 1+a_3b_2 & 1+a_4b_2 \\ 1+a_1b_3 & 1+a_2b_3 & 1+a_3b_3 & 1+a_4b_3 \\ 1+a_1b_4 & 1+a_2b_4 & 1+a_3b_4 & 1+a_4b_4 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{13}$$

If $a_2 \leq 0$, we then replace (a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4) in P by $(-a_4, -a_3, -a_2, -a_1)$ and $(b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4)^t$ by $(-b_4, -b_3, -b_2, -b_1)^t$. The new matrix with $-a_4 \geq -a_3 \geq 0$ has the same likelihood function as P. Thus we may assume $a_1 \geq a_2 \geq 0$. Without loss of generality, we may make the following assumption.

Assumption 6. *We can always assume the following*

1. $a_1 \geq a_2 \geq a_3 \geq a_4$ *and* $b_1 \geq b_2 \geq b_3 \geq b_4$,
2. $a_1 = b_1 > 0$, *and*
3. $a_1 \geq a_2 \geq 0$.

The results in the rest of this section are all based on Assumption 6. Our first goal is to prove $a_2 = b_2$.

Lemma 7. $a_2 = b_2$.

Proof. If one of a_2, b_2 is 0, then $a_2 = b_2 = 0$ by Lemma 4. We assume that both a_2, b_2 are nonzero.

Apply Corollary 3 to the first row of matrix (13). We have

$$\frac{2}{1+a_1^2} + \frac{1}{1+a_2a_1} + \frac{1}{1+a_3a_1} + \frac{1}{1+a_4a_1} = 5.$$

Also

$$a_1^2 + a_2a_1 + a_3a_1 + a_4a_1 = 0.$$

From above two equations we get

$$a_3a_1 \cdot a_4a_1 = f_1(a_1a_1, a_1a_2) \tag{14}$$

where f_1 is a bivariate function in x, y defined as

$$f_1(x, y) = \frac{2-x-y}{5-\frac{2}{1+x}-\frac{1}{1+y}} + x + y - 1.$$

Similarly, apply Corollary 3 to the second row of matrix (13). We get

$$\frac{1}{1+a_1b_2} + \frac{2}{1+a_2b_2} + \frac{1}{1+a_3b_2} + \frac{1}{1+a_4b_2} = 5.$$

Along with

$$a_1b_2 + a_2b_2 + a_3b_2 + a_4b_2 = 0,$$

we get

$$a_3b_2 \cdot a_4b_2 = f_1(a_2b_2, a_1b_2). \tag{15}$$

Since a_1, b_2 are nonzero, we combine equations (14) and (15) to get

$$\frac{f_1(a_1^2, a_1a_2)}{a_1^2} = \frac{f_1(a_2b_2, a_1b_2)}{b_2^2}. \tag{16}$$

Normalizing (16) we can derive a trivariate polynomial equation, say

$$f_2(a_1, a_2, b_2) = 0. \tag{17}$$

Symmetrically apply Corollary 3 to the first column and the second column 13, we get

$$\frac{f_1(a_1^2, a_1b_2)}{a_1^2} = \frac{f_1(a_2b_2, a_1a_2)}{a_2^2}. \tag{18}$$

One can see that equation (18) is obtainable by switching a_2 with b_2 in equation (16). Thus we have

$$f_2(a_1, b_2, a_2) = 0. \tag{19}$$

Subtracting (19) from (17) yields

$$f_2(a_1, a_2, b_2) - f_2(a_1, b_2, a_2) = 0.$$

Since we only switched a_2 and b_2 in polynomial f_2, there must be a factor $a_2 - b_2$ for $f_2(a_1, a_2, b_2) - f_2(a_1, b_2, a_2)$, say

$$(a_2 - b_2)f_3(a_1, a_2, b_2) = 0, \tag{20}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} f_3(a_1, a_2, b_2) = \quad & (20a_1^4b_2^2 + 15a_1^3b_2 + 3a_1^2b_2^2 + 2a_1b_2 - 4b_2^2)a_2^2 \\ & + (3a_1^4b_2 + 15a_1^3b_2^2 + 2a_1^3 + 10a_1^2b_2 + 2a_1b_2^2 - 3a_1 - b_2)a_2 \\ & - 4a_1^4 + 2a_1^3b_2 - a_1^2 - 3a_1b_2 - 2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $a_2 = b_2$ if $f_3(a_1, a_2, b_2) \neq 0$. This is true because we have some bounds for a_1^2, a_1a_2, a_1b_2 as presented in Lemma 8 below, which can be applied to get

$$\begin{aligned} f_3(a_1, a_2, b_2) = \quad & (20a_1^4b_2^2 + 15a_1^3b_2 + 3a_1^2b_2^2 + 2a_1b_2 - 4b_2^2)a_2^2 \\ & + (3a_1^4b_2 + 15a_1^3b_2^2 + 2a_1^3 + 10a_1^2b_2 + 2a_1b_2^2 - 3a_1 - b_2)a_2 \\ & - 4a_1^4 + 2a_1^3b_2 - a_1^2 - 3a_1b_2 - 2 \\ < \quad & \frac{20}{5^4} + \frac{15}{5^3} + \frac{3}{4}a_2^2b_2^2 + \frac{2}{5}a_2b_2 - 4a_2^2b_2^2 \\ & + \frac{3}{2^2 5^2} + \frac{15}{5^3} + \frac{2}{2^2 5} + \frac{10}{5^2} + \frac{2}{5}a_2b_2 - a_2b_2 \\ & + \frac{2}{2^2 5} - 2 \\ < \quad & -\frac{13}{4}a_2^2b_2^2 - \frac{1}{5}a_2b_2 - \frac{549}{500} \\ < \quad & 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $f_3(a_1, a_2, b_2) \neq 0$ and $a_2 = b_2$, just as needed. □

Lemma 8.

(1) *$a_1^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}$,*
(2) *$0 \leq a_1a_2 \leq \frac{1}{5}$, and*
(3) *$0 \leq a_1b_2 \leq \frac{1}{5}$.*

Proof. (1) Let $A_i = 1 + a_1a_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, 4$, then $\sum_{i=1}^{4} A_i = 4$, $A_1 \geq A_2 \geq 1$, $A_3 \geq A_4 > 0$ and

$$\frac{2}{A_1} + \frac{1}{A_2} + \frac{1}{A_3} + \frac{1}{A_4} = 5.$$

Since

$$\frac{1}{A_3} + \frac{1}{A_4} \geq \frac{4}{A_3 + A_4} = \frac{4}{4 - A_1 - A_2},$$

we have

$$5 = \frac{2}{A_1} + \frac{1}{A_2} + \frac{1}{A_3} + \frac{1}{A_4} \geq \frac{2}{A_1} + \frac{1}{A_2} + \frac{4}{4 - A_1 - A_2}. \tag{21}$$

Let

$$g(A_2) = \frac{1}{A_2} + \frac{4}{4 - A_1 - A_2},$$

where g is a function in $\mathbb{R}[x]$. Then

$$\frac{\partial g(A_2)}{\partial A_2} = -\frac{1}{A_2^2} + \frac{4}{(4 - A_1 - A_2)^2}.$$

Note that $A_1 \geq A_2 \geq 1$, thus $4 - A_1 - A_2 \leq 2$ and $\frac{\partial g(A_2)}{\partial A_2} \geq 0$. Therefore $g(A_2) \geq g(1)$ for $A_2 \geq 1$, that is,

$$\frac{1}{A_2} + \frac{4}{4 - A_1 - A_2} \geq 1 + \frac{4}{3 - A_1}.$$

Hence by inequality (21),

$$5 \geq \frac{2}{A_1} + \frac{1}{A_2} + \frac{4}{4 - A_1 - A_2} \geq \frac{2}{A_1} + 1 + \frac{4}{3 - A_1}.$$

We get $2A_1^2 - 5A_1 + 3 \leq 0$, i.e. $1 \leq A_1 \leq \frac{3}{2}$. Thus $a_1^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}$.

(2) Assume $A_2 = 1 + a_1a_2 > \frac{6}{5}$. Then $g(A_2) > g(\frac{6}{5})$. That is,

$$5 \geq \frac{2}{A_1} + \frac{1}{A_2} + \frac{4}{4 - A_1 - A_2} > \frac{2}{A_1} + \frac{5}{6} + \frac{4}{\frac{14}{5} - A_1}.$$

The solution set of A_1 is $(-\infty, 0) \cup (\frac{28}{25}, \frac{6}{5}) \cup (\frac{14}{5}, \infty)$. Note that $A_1 > 0$ and $A_1 = 1 + a_1^2 \leq \frac{3}{2}$, we then get $\frac{28}{25} < A_1 < \frac{6}{5}$, which contradicts with $A_1 \geq A_2$. Thus $A_2 \leq \frac{6}{5}$ and $0 \leq a_1a_2 \leq \frac{1}{5}$.

(3) This result is followed by letting $A_1 = 1 + a_1^2$ and $A_i = 1 + a_1 b_i$ for $i \geq 2$. The above proofs in part (1) and (2) remain good. $\square$

Lemma 9. *$a_i = b_i$ for $i = 3, 4$.*

Proof. Let $A_i = 1 + a_i b_1$ for $i = 1, \ldots, 4$. Then

$$\sum_{i=1}^{4} A_i = 4$$

and

$$\frac{2}{A_1} + \frac{1}{A_2} + \frac{1}{A_3} + \frac{1}{A_4} = 5.$$

By the above two equations, since $A_3 \geq A_4$, we can derive explicit expression for A_3, A_4 in the variables A_1, A_2, say $A_3 = h_1(A_1, A_2)$ and $A_4 = h_2(A_1, A_2)$. If we let $B_i = 1 + a_1 b_i$, we can get $B_3 = h_1(B_1, B_2)$ and $B_4 = h_2(B_1, B_2)$ in a similar manner. Note that $A_1 = B_1$ and $A_2 = 1 + a_2 b_1 = 1 + b_2 a_1 = B_2$, we deduce that $A_i = B_i$ for $i = 3, 4$. Since $a_1 = b_1 > 0$, $a_i = b_i$ for $i = 3, 4$. $\square$

By Lemmas 7 and 9, we have $a_i = b_i$ for all i. Hence P can be expressed as

$$P = \begin{pmatrix} 1 + a_1^2 & 1 + a_2 a_1 & 1 + a_3 a_1 & 1 + a_4 a_1 \\ 1 + a_1 a_2 & 1 + a_2^2 & 1 + a_3 a_2 & 1 + a_4 a_2 \\ 1 + a_1 a_3 & 1 + a_2 a_3 & 1 + a_3^2 & 1 + a_4 a_3 \\ 1 + a_1 a_4 & 1 + a_2 a_4 & 1 + a_3 a_4 & 1 + a_4^2 \end{pmatrix}$$

where

$$\sum_{i=1}^{4} a_i = 0. \tag{22}$$

By Corollary 3 we have the following system of equations

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{2}{1 + a_1^2} + \dfrac{1}{1 + a_2 a_1} + \dfrac{1}{1 + a_3 a_1} + \dfrac{1}{1 + a_4 a_1} = 5, \\ \dfrac{1}{1 + a_1 a_2} + \dfrac{2}{1 + a_2^2} + \dfrac{1}{1 + a_3 a_2} + \dfrac{1}{1 + a_4 a_2} = 5, \\ \dfrac{1}{1 + a_1 a_3} + \dfrac{1}{1 + a_2 a_3} + \dfrac{2}{1 + a_3^2} + \dfrac{1}{1 + a_4 a_3} = 5, \\ \dfrac{1}{1 + a_1 a_4} + \dfrac{1}{1 + a_2 a_4} + \dfrac{1}{1 + a_3 a_4} + \dfrac{2}{1 + a_4^2} = 5. \end{cases} \tag{23}$$

With (22) and (23), we claim that

Lemma 10. *$a_i = a_j$ if $a_i a_j > 0$.*

Proof. Let

$$F(x) = \frac{1}{1+a_1x} + \frac{1}{1+a_2x} + \frac{1}{1+a_3x} + \frac{1}{1+a_4x} + \frac{1}{1+x^2} - 5 = 0.$$

Normalizing $F(x)$ yields a polynomial (the numerator) of degree 6 in x whose constant is 0 and whose coefficient of the term x is $\sum_{i=1}^{4} a_i = 0$. So $a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4, 0, 0$ are all the zeros of $F(x)$. Suppose there exists consecutive i, j such that $a_i > a_j > 0$ (or $a_j < a_i < 0$ respectively). Then $F(x)$ is continuous in the interval $(-\frac{1}{a_j}, -\frac{1}{a_i})$. Note that

$$\lim_{x \to -\frac{1}{a_j}^+} F(x) = \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{x \to -\frac{1}{a_i}^-} F(x) = -\infty.$$

There must be a zero lying in $(-\frac{1}{a_j}, -\frac{1}{a_i})$, say a_0. Then $a_0 < -\frac{1}{a_i}$ (or $a_0 > -\frac{1}{a_j}$ respectively), i.e. $1 + a_ia_0 < 0$ (or $1 + a_ja_0 < 0$ respectively). Since $a_0 \neq 0$, x_0 must be one of a_k, $k = 1, \ldots, 4$. Thus $1 + a_ia_0$ (or $1 + a_ja_0$, respectively) is an entry in matrix P, contradicting the fact that each entry of P is positive. Therefore if i, j are consecutive and $a_ia_j > 0$, we must have $a_i = a_j$. Hence $a_ia_j > 0$ implies $a_i = a_j$ for any i, j. ☐

With Lemma 10 it is handy to solve the system (23). Under Assumption (6) there are only 4 possible patterns of signs for (a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4). If the signs are $(+,+,+,-)$, then $a_1 = a_2 = a_3 = -\frac{1}{3}a_4$. Substitute this to any equation in (23) yields $a_1 = a_2 = a_3 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{15}}$ and $a_4 = -\frac{3}{\sqrt{15}}$. The matrix would be

$$P_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{16}{15} & \frac{16}{15} & \frac{16}{15} & \frac{4}{5} \\ \frac{16}{15} & \frac{16}{15} & \frac{16}{15} & \frac{4}{5} \\ \frac{16}{15} & \frac{16}{15} & \frac{16}{15} & \frac{4}{5} \\ \frac{4}{5} & \frac{4}{5} & \frac{4}{5} & \frac{8}{5} \end{pmatrix}.$$

For the case when the signs are $(+,+,-,-)$, we get $a_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{5}}$ and the matrix would be

$$P_2 = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{6}{5} & \frac{6}{5} & \frac{4}{5} & \frac{4}{5} \\ \frac{6}{5} & \frac{6}{5} & \frac{4}{5} & \frac{4}{5} \\ \frac{4}{5} & \frac{4}{5} & \frac{6}{5} & \frac{6}{5} \\ \frac{4}{5} & \frac{4}{5} & \frac{6}{5} & \frac{6}{5} \end{pmatrix}.$$

When the signs are $(+,+,0,-)$, $a_1 = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}$, and the matrix would be

$$P_3 = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{9}{8} & \frac{9}{8} & 1 & \frac{3}{4} \\ \frac{9}{8} & \frac{9}{8} & 1 & \frac{3}{4} \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ \frac{3}{4} & \frac{3}{4} & 1 & \frac{3}{2} \end{pmatrix}.$$

And when the signs are $(+,0,0,-)$, $a_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}$ and the matrix would be

$$P_4 = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{4}{3} & 1 & 1 & \frac{2}{3} \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ \frac{2}{3} & 1 & 1 & \frac{4}{3} \end{pmatrix}.$$

The matrices obtaining local maximum of the likelihood function must be among the matrices above. We conclude that matrix P_2 obtains the global maximum. Finally, multiplying matrix P_2 by $\frac{1}{16}$ yields

$$P = \frac{1}{40}\begin{pmatrix} 3 & 3 & 2 & 2 \\ 3 & 3 & 2 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 3 & 3 \\ 2 & 2 & 3 & 3 \end{pmatrix}.$$

4. Some comments on general cases and discussion

A natural question arises here is that why Gröbner basis technique [6], the most powerful tool for solving systems of polynomial equations, does not work efficiently for this particular problem. We get a polynomial $(a_2 - b_2)f_3(a_1, a_2, b_2)$ in the proof for Lemma (7). Our approach is to justify the factor $f_3(a_1, a_2, b_2)$, a trivariate polynomial with 17 terms, is nonzero by applying some bounds from Lemma 8, so that we can derive the simplest equation $a_2 - b_2 = 0$. In the proof we used the fact that we are looking only for real solutions. However, a Gröbner basis encodes both real and complex solutions. It is possible that $f_3(a_1, a_2, b_2)$ is zero for some complex solutions. The locus of all solutions may be much more complicated than that of real solutions, hence the Gröbner basis is much more time consuming to compute.

The limitation of our work is that the arguments in the last section only work for $n = 4$. For $n > 4$ we are still lack of an efficient method. However, our methods can still be applied to general likelihood functions. In the following, we illustrate for a few examples.

Conjecture 11. *For given $0 < t < s$ where t, s are two integers, among the set of all non-negative 4×4 matrices whose rank is at most 2 and whose entries sum to 1, the matrix*

$$P = \frac{1}{4s+12t}\begin{pmatrix} \frac{s+t}{2} & \frac{s+t}{2} & t & t \\ \frac{s+t}{2} & \frac{s+t}{2} & t & t \\ t & t & \frac{s+t}{2} & \frac{s+t}{2} \\ t & t & \frac{s+t}{2} & \frac{s+t}{2} \end{pmatrix}$$

is a global maximum for the following likelihood function

$$L(P) = \prod_{i=1}^{4} p_{ii}^{s} \times \prod_{i \neq j} p_{ij}^{t}. \tag{24}$$

The results in Section 2 remain good for this likelihood function. The equation (10) becomes

$$\frac{b_1}{1+a_ib_1} + \frac{b_2}{1+a_ib_2} + \frac{b_3}{1+a_ib_3} + \frac{b_4}{1+a_ib_4} + \frac{(\frac{s}{t}-1)a_i}{1+a_ib_i} = 0.$$

But the bounds in Lemma 8 involve the fraction $\frac{s}{t}$ and become complicated. A similar equation to (20) can be derived, but the nonzero factor is difficult to claim. Hopefully we may also prove $a_2 = b_2$. Then $a_3 = b_3$ and $a_4 = b_4$ can be derived in a similar manner to Lemma 9. So does Lemma 10. Finally we can find 4 local extrema and need only compare them to obtain the global maximum. In the case when the signs of (a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4) are $(+, +, +, -)$, we have the equation

$$a_1^2((3s+9t)a_1^2 - (s-t)) = 0.$$

Thus $a_1 = \sqrt{\frac{s-t}{3s+9t}}$, and the matrix would be

$$P_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{4s+8t}{3s+9t} & \frac{4s+8t}{3s+9t} & \frac{4s+8t}{3s+9t} & \frac{12t}{3s+9t} \\ \frac{4s+8t}{3s+9t} & \frac{4s+8t}{3s+9t} & \frac{4s+8t}{3s+9t} & \frac{12t}{3s+9t} \\ \frac{4s+8t}{3s+9t} & \frac{4s+8t}{3s+9t} & \frac{4s+8t}{3s+9t} & \frac{12t}{3s+9t} \\ \frac{12t}{3s+9t} & \frac{12t}{3s+9t} & \frac{12t}{3s+9t} & \frac{12s}{3s+9t} \end{pmatrix}.$$

In the case when the signs are $(+,+,-,-)$, we get $a_1 = \sqrt{\frac{s-t}{s+3t}}$ and the matrix would be

$$P_2 = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{2s+2t}{s+3t} & \frac{2s+2t}{s+3t} & \frac{4t}{s+3t} & \frac{4t}{s+3t} \\ \frac{2s+2t}{s+3t} & \frac{2s+2t}{s+3t} & \frac{4t}{s+3t} & \frac{4t}{s+3t} \\ \frac{4t}{s+3t} & \frac{4t}{s+3t} & \frac{2s+2t}{s+3t} & \frac{2s+2t}{s+3t} \\ \frac{4t}{s+3t} & \frac{4t}{s+3t} & \frac{2s+2t}{s+3t} & \frac{2s+2t}{s+3t} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{25}$$

One can prove that $L(P_1) < L(P_2)$ by some calculus technique, for example, taking the partial derivative of $\frac{L(P_1)}{L(P_2)}$ with respect to s. In similar approaches one can also show that $L(P_3) < L(P_2)$ and $L(P_4) < L(P_2)$ where P_3, P_4 are the corresponding matrices for the cases when signs are $(+,+,0,-)$ and $(+,0,0,-)$ respectively. Thus the matrix in (25) is a global maximum.

More generally, let $(u)_{l_1 \times l_2}$ be a block matrix with every entry being u where $l_1 \times l_2 \in \mathbb{N}^2$ and $u > 0$.

Conjecture 12. *Let $n \geq 2$ and $0 < t < s$. Then the matrix*

$$P = \frac{1}{ns + (n-1)nt} \begin{pmatrix} (\frac{s-t}{\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil} + t)_{\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil \times \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil} & (t)_{\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil \times \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor} \\ (t)_{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor \times \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil} & (\frac{s-t}{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor} + t)_{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor \times \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor} \end{pmatrix}$$

is a global maximum for the likelihood function $L(P)$ in (24).

Conjecture 13. *Let $n \geq 2$ and $0 < s \leq t$. Then the matrix*

$$P = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{2s}{n^2(s+t)} & \frac{1}{n^2} & \cdots & \frac{1}{n^2} & \frac{2t}{n^2(s+t)} \\ \frac{1}{n^2} & \frac{1}{n^2} & \cdots & \frac{1}{n^2} & \frac{1}{n^2} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \frac{1}{n^2} & \frac{1}{n^2} & \cdots & \frac{1}{n^2} & \frac{1}{n^2} \\ \frac{2t}{n^2(s+t)} & \frac{1}{n^2} & \cdots & \frac{1}{n^2} & \frac{2s}{n^2(s+t)} \end{pmatrix}$$

is a global maximum for the likelihood function $L(P)$ in (24).

Acknowledgment. The authors were partially supported by the National Science Foundation under grant DMS-0302549 and National Security Agency under grant H98230-08-1-0030. We wish to thank Bernd Sturmfels for his encouragement.

References

[1] F. Catanese, S. Hoşten, A. Khetan and B. Sturmfels, The maximum likelihood degree, *American Journal of Mathematics* 128 (2006), 671-697.

[2] S. Fienberg, P. Hersh, A. Rinaldo and Y. Zhou, Maximum likelihood estimation in latent class models for contingency table data, to appear as a chapter in *Algebraic and geometric methods in statistics*, Cambridge University Press.

[3] N.W. Henry and P.F. Lazarfeld, *Latent Structure Analysis*, Houghton Mufflin Company, 1968.

[4] S. Hoşten, A. Khetan and B. Sturmfels, Solving the likelihood equations, *Foundations of Computational Mathematics* 5 (2005), 389-407.

[5] L. Pachter and B. Sturmfels, *Algebraic Statistics for Computational Biology*, Cambridge University Press, 2005.

[6] B. Sturmfels, *Solving Systems of Polynomial Equations*, CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics, vol 97, Amer. Math. Society, Providence, 2002.

[7] B. Sturmfels, Open problems in Algebraic Statistics, in *Emerging Applications of Algebraic Geometry*, (editors M. Putinar and S. Sullivant), I.M.A. Volumes in Mathematics and its Applications, 149, Springer, New York, 2008, pp. 351-364.

Department of Mathematical Sciences, Clemson University, Clemson, SC 29634-0975, USA
E-mail address: `sgao@clemson.edu`

Department of Computer Science, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, Zhejiang, 310027, China
E-mail address: `rpggpr@zju.edu.cn`

Department of Mathematical Sciences, Clemson University, Clemson, SC 29634-0975, USA
E-mail address: `mzhu@clemson.edu`